



*Handwritten initials and marks in the top right corner.*

<b>TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF (Small Entity)</b>	Docket No. <b>VID-02202/29</b>
---	--------------------------------

In ~~Re~~ Application Of: **Schwab et al**

Application No. <b>09/900,827</b>	Filing Date <b>07/06/2001</b>	Examiner <b>T. Lee</b>	Customer No. <b>25006</b>	Group Art Unit <b>2157</b>	Confirmation No. <b>8990</b>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

Invention: **PORTABLE COMMUNICATIONS DEVICE**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith in ~~triplicate~~ is the Appeal Brief in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on:

*August 31, 2005*

☒ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is: **\$250.00**

- ☐ A check in the amount of the fee is enclosed.
- ☐ The Director has already been authorized to charge fees in this application to a Deposit Account.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-1180**
- ☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

**WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.**

*Handwritten signature of John G. Posa*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Dated: **Oct. 31, 2005**

**John G. Posa**  
Reg. No. 37,424  
Gifford, Krass, Groh  
PO Box 7021  
Troy, MI 48007  
Tel. 734/913-9300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on	
Oct. 31, 2005	(Date)
<i>Handwritten signature of Sheryl L. Hammer</i>	
Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence	
<b>Sheryl L. Hammer</b>	
Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence	

CC:

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re application of: Schwab et al

Serial No.: 09/900,827

Group No.: 2157

Filed: July 6, 2001

Examiner: T. Lee

For: PORTABLE COMMUNICATIONS DEVICE

**APPELLANTS' BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §1.192**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

**I. Real Party in Interest**

The real party and interest in this case is Barry H. Schwab and John G. Posa, Applicants and Appellants.

| 11/03/2005 DTESSEM1 00000002 071180 09900827

| 01 FC:2402 250.00 DA

**II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**III. Status of Claims**

The present application was filed with 7 claims. Claims 1-2 were canceled by amendment in February 2005. Claims 3 and 5-7 are pending, rejected and under appeal. Claim 4 has been canceled by amendment filed herewith. Claim 3 is the sole independent claim.

**IV. Status of Amendments Filed Subsequent  
Final Rejection**

An after-final amendment is being filed herewith. The amendment to claim 3 and the cancellation of claim 4 is reflected in Appendix A - Appealed Claims.

**V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of improving hands-free operation in a communications device having a speed-dial function. The method includes the steps of storing a plurality of telephone numbers in the device in advance of dialing the numbers, entering an abbreviated command to sequence through the dialing of each stored number, and automatically deleting a number after a call to that number has been completed. (Specification, page 5, lines 8-16).

**VI. Grounds of Objection/Rejection To Be Reviewed On Appeal**

A. The rejection of claim 1 (as amended) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,721,577 to Humes in view of Lieben, U.S. Patent No. 6,081,730.

**VII. Argument**

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Humes in view of Lieben. By way of an amendment submitted herewith, the limitation of claim 4 has been imported into claim 1.

The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to combine these references “for the purpose of lowering memory administration complexity and allocation for a mobile [sic].” Appellants disagree.

First, there is no teaching or suggestion *from the prior art* to combine these references. In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must provide a reason why one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have been led to combine the cited references to arrive at Appellants’ claimed invention. There must be something *in the prior art* that suggests the proposed combination, other than the hindsight gained from knowledge that the inventor choose to combine these particular things in this particular way. Uniroyal Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner is also required to make specific findings on a suggestion to combine prior-art references. In Re Dembeczak, 175 F.3d 994, 1000-01, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617-19 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

In this case, there is no teaching or suggestion from Humes or Lieben to add a delete function to Humes. The “purpose of lowering memory administration complexity and allocation” is not a stated

goal of Humes (or Lieben, for that matter). Moreover, to add a delete function to Humes would defeat an important principle of operation of Humes, namely, to have stored links for the same message recipient in case communication using one or more of the links fails. The Examiner has cited Humes as "storing a plurality of numbers in the device in advance of dialing the numbers." However, the disclosure only applies to a single, narrow case --- one in which all of the numbers on the list are associated with a single subscriber (Col. 4, lines 6-16):

In accordance with the teachings of the present invention, the first directory number may be associated with a particular subscriber's office phone. The second directory number may be associated with his or her mobile phone, the third directory number may be associated with his or her home phone, and the last directory number may be associated with his or her pager or voice-mail system. As a result, all of the directory numbers representing a particular user are then sequentially correlated, stored, and maintained in a link list fashion.

Further confirmation is available by examining Figure 2, which depicts "a block diagram of data structure storing a link list of directory numbers within a mobile station in accordance with the present invention". As is clear from the text of the disclosure, Humes contemplates only paths in the "horizontal" direction viz. a sequence that follows the link list 210 to 220 to 230 to ... to 240. To accomplish this, Humes introduces the concept of an "address pointer" (Col. 3, line 54 to Col. 4, line 1) for establishing a link list.

Thus, if Humes were provided with an automatic delete function, the address pointers would not work and the links would be broken, rendering Humes unfit for its stated purpose. If a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, for the arguments of record and the reasons set forth above, all pending claims of the subject application continue to be in condition for allowance and Appellants seek the Board's concurrence at this time.

Serial No. 09/900,827

- 4 -

53110sh

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000

Date: Oct. 31, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John G. Posa

Reg. No. 34,424

Gifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,

Anderson & Citkowski, P.C.

PO Box 7021

Troy, MI 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300

**APPENDIX A**

**CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

3. In a communications device having a speed-dial function, a method of improving hands-free operation, including the steps of:

storing a plurality of telephone numbers in the device in advance of dialing the numbers;  
entering an abbreviated command to sequence through the dialing of each stored number; and  
automatically deleting a number after a call to that number has been completed.

5. The method of claim 3, including the step of skipping a number which was unanswered for later recall.

6. The method of claim 3, wherein the abbreviated command is manually entered.

7. The method of claim 3, wherein the abbreviated command is spoken by a user.

Serial No. 09/900,827

- 6 -

53110sh

**APPENDIX B**

**EVIDENCE**

None.

Serial No. 09/900,827

- 7 -

53110sh

**APPENDIX C**

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

None.